

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 10-12, 25 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,957,075 B1 (hereinafter, "Iverson"). Claims 4, 8-16, 18-21 and 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iverson and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0105543 A1 (hereinafter, "Dong"). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iverson and U.S. Patent No. 7,095,456 B2 (hereinafter "Nakajima"). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iverson, Dong and Nakajima. Applicant submits the following in traversal.

Rejection of claims 10-12, 25 and 34 under §112, second paragraph

Applicant submits minor changes to claim 10 to overcome the rejection of claims 10-12. It appears that claim 10 should have depended from claim 9 and not depend from claim 8.

Applicant submits that claims 10-12, 25 and 34 comply with § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 22 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Iverson.

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable because Iverson fails to teach each and every element of the claim. Claim 1 recites:

A user interface (UI) support apparatus, comprising:

a UI support module operable to store input/output modules as stored input/output modules, wherein the stored input/output modules are selected corresponding to conditions of respective users, in an input/output module storing unit, operable to search the input/output module storing unit for a specific input/output module of one of the respective users, operable to execute the specific input/output module, and operable to support a UI meeting a condition of the one of the respective users.

For example, Iverson fails to disclose a UI support module wherein the stored input/output modules are selected corresponding to conditions of respective users, as recited in claim 1. In contrast, Iverson discloses that an appliance personality is identified according to the location of the appliance. Col. 7, lines 2-9. In other words, the selected appliance personality is not based on the user.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Iverson fails to disclose that stored input/output modules are selected corresponding to conditions of respective users. For example, Iverson fails to disclose any sort of correspondence between appliance personalities and users.

Since the Iverson fails to disclose the claimed UI support module, claim 1 is not anticipated and thus, patentable.

For reasons submitted for claim 1, claims 2-3, 5 and 6, which depend from claim 1, are patentable.

For reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, claim 22 is patentable.

Rejection of claims 4, 8-16, 18-21 and 23-34 under §103(a) over Iverson and Dong

Claim 4, which depends from claim 1, and claims 23-27, which depend from claim 22, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims and because Dong fails to make up for the deficiencies of claim 1.

Claim 8 and 13 are patentable for reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1. For example, Iverson and Dong fail to disclose input/output modules corresponding to conditions of respective users, in combination with other elements of the claims.

Similarly, claims 28 and 30 are patentable because Iverson and Dong fail to disclose searching for the input/output module corresponding to the condition ID (claim 28) and providing a UI meeting the condition of the one of the respective users (claim 30).

Claims 9-11, which depend from claim 8, claims 14-16 and 18-21, which depend from claim 13, claims 23-27, which depend from claim 22, claim 29, which depends from claim 28, and claims 31-34, which depend from claim 30, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims.

Rejection of claims 7 under §103(a) over Iverson and Nakajima

Claim 7, which depends from claim 1, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 1 and because Nakajima fails to make up for the deficiencies of Iverson.

Rejection of claims 17 under §103(a) over Iverson, Dong and Nakajima

Claim 17, which indirectly depends from claim 13, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 13 and because Dong and Nakajima fail to make up for the deficiencies of Iverson..

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No.: 10/824,434

Attorney Docket No.: Q80016

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Seok-Won Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Seok-Won Stuart Lee  
Limited Recognition No. L0212

Date: August 14, 2007